

March 16, 2010

I am a Senior Special Agent with the Department of Attorney General, Health Care Fraud Division. I have been a state employee for 35 years.

In these difficult economic times, I believe that true solidarity is what is best for the State of Michigan residents and what can we all do to help Michigan recover. Although it is a bill with many disincentives, I am in favor of House Bill No. 5954, but not as written. Section 19J, Paragraph (1) (E) , addresses only those employees who occupy positions subject to the new Health Plan Preferred Provider Organization would be eligible for the increased multiplier. This paragraph was added by the Governor which I find to be discriminatory. It needs to be emphasized that this bill is not an early out as it has been so often described, but a bill to encourage/coerce those employees who already meet the retirement criteria to leave this year.

My question to you is why the governor would discriminate against me for my required membership in a union. My concerns have been addressed with my union's Board of Director's with a response of no more concessions; I now feel like a pawn being shuffled around on the chessboard of negotiations and placed in a catch 22. This is such a hurtful position to be placed in by those two entities after 35 years of productive and loyal service.

My request is to urge you to amend the House Bill by striking Paragraph (1)(E) thereby allowing all state employees who are otherwise eligible to be included in the Retirement Allowance of the House Bill No. 5954. Thank you so much for your time.

Jacquelyn M. Lack